

REMARKS


Claims 1-21 and 39-49 are pending. By this amendment, claims 1 and 39 are amended and claims 50-68 are added. No new matter will be incorporated into the present application by entry of this Amendment. If the Office determines that any additional fees are deemed to be necessary with the filing of this Amendment, then the Office is authorized and requested to charge such fees to Deposit Account No. 061910.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-9, 12-21, 39-42 and 45-46 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Krisko (WO 00/37377) in view of Yasar (U.S. Patent. No. 5,958,134). Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration in light of the claim amendments and following arguments.

Amended independent claims 1 and 39 each call for a method of processing a sheet-like glass substrate and requires operating an ion gun to treat the entire bottom major surface of the glass substrate as the substrate travels the path of substrate travel. Claims 1 and 39 are not obvious in view of the cited references because there is no suggestion or motivation in the cited references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the references or combine the reference teachings.

As amended, claims 1 and 39 each call for a method of processing a sheet-like glass substrate. A reference employed in an obviousness rejection must be in the same field as the invention or the reference must be reasonably pertinent to the particular problem addressed by the invention. Yasar is non-analogous art because it does not relate to processing glass sheets. Rather, Yasar is directed to methods for forming the longitudinal edges of stacks of razor blades. Razor blade processing is a substantially different art than glass sheet processing. The problems and challenges experienced in razor blade processing are entirely different than challenges presented in glass sheet processing. For example, one challenge in glass sheet processing, that is addressed by the invention, is that of the overspray problem. As a glass sheet is conveyed through a coater, material is deposited downwardly onto the top surface of the substrate. Some of this material may find its way onto the bottom surface of the substrate. This phenomenon has been found to leave unwanted coating on marginal portions of the substrate's bottom surface and is referred to as the "overspray problem". The overspray problem is discussed in further detail in the specification, for example, beginning on page 16, line 37 and ending on page 18, line 24.

A person of skill in the art would not look towards Yasar to solve the overspray problem since this problem would not arise during razor blade processing. Razor-blades are processed in an entirely different manner than glass sheets and do not experience overspray problems. For example, with reference to Yasar's Figure 3, illustrated below, Yasar teaches coating all of the edge sides 68, 70 and edge tips 72 of the razor blades. *See, e.g., Col. 6, lines 33-36.*



Often times during glass sheet processing, one surface is coated with material, while the other surface remains free of coating material or is coated with a different coating material. Yasar does not teach coating only one surface of a razor blade while maintaining another surface free of coating material or coating another surface with a different material. Since all surfaces of the blades are coated with the same material, the razor blades do not experience the overspray problem.

Amended claims 1 and 39 also each require operating the ion gun to emit an ion beam toward a bottom major surface of the substrate to treat the entire bottom surface of the substrate. In the claimed glass sheet processing method, the entire surface of the glass sheet is treated with an ion gun. This is not the case with razor blade processing. For example, in Yasar, only the edge sides of the razor blades are treated with an ion gun. With continued reference to Figure 3, Yasar's ion guns are oriented so that ion beams are directed towards the edge sides 68, 70. The ion guns shape and sharpen the razor blade edges. Yasar would not treat the entire surface of a razor blade since the edges are the parts that provide the razor functions. Thus, Yasar provides no motivation for treating an entire surface of a substrate with an ion gun.

Since Yasar fails to appreciate any problem seen in glass sheet processing, including the overspray problem, one of skill in the art seeking to solve problems in glass sheet processing would not be motivated to combine any reference or teaching in the art with Yasar. In addition, there is no other motivation in Yasar and/or Krisko which would cause one in the art to combine

these references to achieve the claimed invention. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the rejections of claims 1, 39, and claims depending thereon.

The Examiner again objected to claims 10-11 and 43-44 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and intervening claims. Applicant thanks the Examiner for indication of allowable subject matter. Allowed independent claim 48 already incorporates all elements of original independent claim 1 and dependent claim 10 and allowed independent claim 49 incorporates all elements of original independent claim 39 and dependent claim 43.

It is submitted that claims of application are in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance of the application are respectfully requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned if the Examiner believes it would be useful to advance prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,



Kara K. Fairbairn
Registration No. 49,079

Customer No. 22859
Fredrikson & Byron, P.A.
200 South Sixth Street
Suite 4000
Minneapolis, MN 55402-1425 USA
Telephone: (612) 492-7000
Facsimile: (612) 492-7077

Please grant any extension of time necessary for entry; charge any fee due to Deposit Account No. 06-1910.

4116133_1.DOC